

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 BRE'VELLE CROCKETT,) CASE NO. CV 13-7785-AG-PJW
11)
12 Plaintiff,) ORDER DISMISSING ACTION FOR
13) FAILURE TO PROSECUTE
14 v.)
15)
16 EVERETT C. COTTRELL, ET. AL.,)
17)
18 Defendants.)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

17 In October 2013, Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil
18 rights action against Everett C. Cottrell, a Captain at FCI-Terminal
19 Island Medical Center, and ten other prison officials there, alleging
20 that they violated his constitutional rights when they falsified an
21 incident report, locked him up in the SHU, refused to provide him with
22 a disciplinary hearing so that he could challenge the charges, and
23 retaliated against him when he exercised his constitutional right to
24 speak out. He also alleged that the conditions in the SHU were cruel
25 and unusual.

26 In April 2015, Defendants moved for partial summary judgment on
27 four of Plaintiff's claims and for dismissal of the rest. Plaintiff
28 did not oppose the motion. In October 2015, the magistrate judge

1 recommended partial summary judgment as to the four claims but
2 concluded that Plaintiff should be allowed to proceed on his remaining
3 claims. Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report and
4 Recommendation and the Court adopted it.

5 Thereafter, the magistrate judge issued a scheduling order with
6 discovery deadlines. On June 8, 2016, Defendants served Plaintiff
7 with a notice of deposition, requests for production, and
8 interrogatories. Plaintiff failed to appear for his deposition. He
9 also failed to respond to the written discovery. On July 19, 2016,
10 Defendants sent Plaintiff a letter asking him to respond to the
11 discovery requests. Plaintiff did not respond.

12 On July 26, 2016, the Court ordered Plaintiff to provide his
13 phone number, re-schedule his deposition, and respond to discovery.
14 Plaintiff never responded. The Court then issued an order to show
15 cause as to why the case should not be dismissed for failure to
16 prosecute. Plaintiff was warned that failure to respond would result
17 in his case being dismissed. Plaintiff did not appear for the hearing
18 nor did he provide the Court with an explanation as to why he did not
19 appear. In fact, since Plaintiff filed a change of address in October
20 2014, he has not communicated with the Court.

21 The Court has authority to dismiss an action for failure to
22 prosecute and for failure to comply with court orders. Fed. R. Civ.
23 P. 41(b); *Link v. Wabash Railroad Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629-30 (1962)
24 (explaining district court has authority to dismiss for lack of
25 prosecution to prevent undue delay in disposing of pending cases and
26 to avoid congestion in court's calendar); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d
27 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992) (finding district courts have authority to
28 dismiss actions for failure to comply with any order of the court).

1 In determining whether dismissal is appropriate, the Court considers
2 five factors: (1) the public's interest in the expeditious resolution
3 of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk
4 of prejudice to defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition
5 of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic
6 sanctions. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d 1258 at 1260-61.

7 In this case, the first two factors--the public's interest in the
8 expeditious resolution of litigation and the court's need to manage
9 its docket--weigh heavily in favor of dismissal. Plaintiff's refusal
10 to engage with the Court and Defendants' counsel has caused this case
11 to linger on the docket for almost three years.

12 As for the third factor--prejudice to Defendants--they have spent
13 considerable time and money defending against this lawsuit and will
14 have to continue to do so until the case is resolved. They are unable
15 to resolve the case, however, if Plaintiff will not cooperate in
16 discovery. Further, as time goes by, the witnesses' memories of the
17 events will likely begin to fade, which could prejudice Defendants at
18 trial.

19 Although the fourth factor--the public policy in favor of
20 deciding cases on the merits--ordinarily weighs against dismissal, it
21 is Plaintiff's responsibility to move the case along and he has
22 elected not to. *Morris v. Morgan Stanley*, 942 F.2d 648, 652 (9th Cir.
23 1991).

24 Finally, as to the fifth factor--availability of less drastic
25 alternatives--the Court has considered the possibility of alternative
26 sanctions but has been unable to craft an order that would convince
27 Plaintiff to proceed with prosecuting this case. In fact, the Court
28 has tried on several occasions to convince Plaintiff to participate by

1 threatening to dismiss the case if he did not cooperate but that has
2 had no impact on him. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262 (citing *Malone v. U.S.*
3 *Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 132-33 (9th Cir. 1987)) (explaining,
4 warning a plaintiff that failure to obey a court order will result in
5 dismissal of the case is enough to meet the "consideration of
6 alternatives" requirement). Under these circumstances, dismissal for
7 failure to prosecute is warranted. See *Link*, 370 U.S. at 629-30.


8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: August 31, 2016.

10
11
12 

13 ANDREW J. GUILFORD
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

15 Presented by:

16 
17
18 PATRICK J. WALSH
19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 C:\Users\imartine\AppData\Local\Temp\notesC7A056\Crockett ORD_Dismiss.Failure to Prosecute.wpd